

United States Patent and Trademark Office

 μ

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	. FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,872	08/20/2003	Yukio Katsuzawa	392.1809	5202
21171	7590 11/12/200	4	EXAM	INER
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			nguyen, hanh n	
SUITE 700 1201 NEW Y	SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			PAPER NUMBER
	ON, DC 20005		2834	
			DATE MAILED: 11/12/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/643,872	KATSUZAWA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Nguyen N Hanh	2834			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stany reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r n. a reply within the statutory minimum of thin rirod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tatute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133)			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	<u> 16 August 2004</u> .				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□	This action is non-final.				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 August 2004 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ ob the drawing(s) be held in abeyan rection is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		Office Action of John 1 10-132.			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in Appriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)		•			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)			
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date)/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 			

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "a fan on the side opposite the motor body with respect to the cylindrical member" in claims 3, 4 and 6 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiroyuki et al. (JP 10-146021) in view of Endo.

Regarding claim 1, Hiroyuki et al. show an air-cooled motor comprising: a motor body in which a through hole (7 in Fig. 1) is formed in a rotary shaft; a supply section (33) for supplying a fluid to the through hole; a cylindrical member (4) surrounding the supply section; and a cooling fan (37) provided on the side opposite the motor body with respect to the cylindrical member, wherein a passage (shown by arrows inside

Application/Control Number: 10/643,872

Art Unit: 2834

cylindrical member) to distribute cooling air toward the cooling fan is provided in the cylindrical member. Hiroyuki et al. fail to show a window is provided in the cylindrical member so that the supply section can be visually observed.

However, Endo discloses an electric machine comprising a capsule (or a housing) to cover the components of the electric machine and a window (25 in Fig. 4) provided on the capsule for the purpose of observing the state of operation of the machine (abstract and Col. 1, lines 27-32)

Since Hiroyuki et al. and Endo are in the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Endo would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Hiroyuki et al.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having an ordinary skill in the art to modify Hiroyuki et al. by providing a window in the cylindrical member so that the supply section can be visually observed as taught by Endo for the purpose of observing the state of operation of the machine.

Regarding claim 3, Hiroyuki et al. show all limitations of the claimed invention except showing a cylindrical member wherein at least a part of the cylindrical member is made of a transparent material so that the supply section can be visually observed.

However, Endo discloses an electric machine comprising a capsule (or a housing) to cover the components of the electric machine and wherein the capsule is made of a transparent material for the purpose of observing the state of operation of the machine (abstract and Col. 1, lines 27-32)

Since Hiroyuki et al. and Endo are in the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Endo would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Hiroyuki et al.

Art Unit: 2834

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having an ordinary skill in the art to modify Hiroyuki et al. by forming the cylindrical member with a transparent material so that the supply section can be visually observed as taught by Endo for the purpose of observing the state of operation of the machine.

Regarding claim 2, Hiroyuki et al. and Endo disclose the claimed invention except for showing the window is detachably. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the window detachably, since it has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art. Nerwin v. Erlichman, 168 USPQ 177, 179.

Regarding claim 4, Hiroyuki et al. also show the air-cooled motor wherein a passage for distributing cooling air toward the cooling fan is provided in the cylindrical member (Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 5, Hiroyuki et al. and Endo disclose the claimed invention (refer to the rejection of claim 1) except for showing the window is detachable. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the window detachably, since it has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art. Nerwin v. Erlichman, 168 USPQ 177, 179.

Regarding claim 6, Hiroyuki et al. and Endo disclose the claimed invention (refer to the rejection of claim 3) except for showing the transparent part is detachable. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 2834

was made to make the transparent part detachable, since it has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art. Nerwin v. Erlichman, 168 USPQ 177, 179.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 8/26/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant's argument is on the ground that "the reference the Examiner relies on, Endo, does not suggest discovery of an abnormal state of the supply section of the motor, therefore Endo does not provide any motivation to combine Endo with JP 10-146201". The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. It is noted that there is essentially no difference between the structure of JP 10-146201 and the structure of the present invention. The only difference is the provision of the window to observe the area of interest inside the motor (in the instant case, the supply section). However, Endo taught a window can be use observe the area of interest inside the motor (an operation-indicating wheel). Therefore, it is obvious to modify JP 10-146201 as suggested by Endo.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Application/Control Number: 10/643,872 Page 6

Art Unit: 2834

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Information on How to Contact USPTO

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh N Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2031. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner 's supervisor, Darren Schuberge, can be reached on (571) 272-2044. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

HNN

November 5, 2004

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY SENTER 2800